arXiv:gr-qc/9505045v1 24 May 1995

Temperature and Relativity

Sandro S. Costa and George E. A. Matsas

Instituto de Física Teórica/UNESP

Rua Pamplona 145

01405-900-São Paulo, São Paulo

Brazil

February 7, 2008

Abstract

We investigate whether inertial thermometers moving in a thermal bath behave as being hotter or colder. This question is directly related to the classical controversy concerning how temperature transforms under Lorentz transformations. Rather than basing our arguments on thermodynamical hypotheses, we perform straightforward calculations in the context of relativistic quantum field theory. For this purpose we use Unruh-DeWitt detectors, since they have been shown to be reliable thermometers in semi-classical gravity. We believe that our discussion helps in definitely clarifying this issue.

The problem of constructing a relativistic thermodynamical theory was the source of an intense discussion for a long time (see the editorials in Ref. [1], and Refs. [2-14]). In particular, the question of how temperature transforms under Lorentz transformations led some distinguished physicists to reach exactly the opposite conclusion of other equally distinguished ones. In order to set up the problem clearly, consider a thermal bath with temperature T_0 with respect to its inertial rest frame S_0. According to Einstein [2], Planck [3], Tolman [4], Pauli [5], and Von Laue [6] among others, a distinct inertial reference frame S moving with constant velocity v with respect to S_0 would ascribe to this thermal bath a smaller temperature given by $T = T_0\sqrt{1-v^2}$. Lately, however, this result was challenged by various authors. Ott [7] and Arzeliès [8], for instance, reached exactly the opposite conclusion, *i.e.* $T = T_0/\sqrt{1-v^2}$, while Landsberg [10] claimed that $T = T_0$. Although differing in the results, the approaches on which these discussions were based shared the same thermodynamical nature.

This paper is dedicated to revisit this problem from a completely different point of view. We shall investigate explicitly how a thermometer moving with constant velocity v with respect to a thermal bath behaves by using quantum field theory methods. For this purpose, we use an Unruh-DeWitt detector, since it has been shown to be a reliable thermometer in the context of semi-classical gravity. It is known that the Minkowski vacuum is invariant under Lorentz transformations, and consequently every inertial thermometer moving in the Minkowski vacuum measures zero temperature. However, in the mid seventies Unruh [15] and Davies [16] showed that a uniformly accelerated thermometer in the Minkowski vacuum would measure a temperature proportional to its proper acceleration. Thus, it is natural to investigate in this context how an inertial thermometer moving with respect to an ordinary thermal bath would behave. The main virtues of this approach is that it is intrinsically covariant, and that it does not depend on any thermodynamical hypotheses. Natural units ($c = k = \hbar = 1$) will be assumed throughout the paper.

An Unruh-DeWitt detector [15, 17] is a two–level monopole which can be either in the ground state $|E_0\rangle$ or in an excited state $|E\rangle$. For the sake of simplicity, we couple the detector to massless scalar particles rather than photons, since both fields behave

similarly. The total excitation probability associated with a detector moving through a background thermal bath with temperature T_0 can be computed by standard quantum field theory methods [18]:

$$\mathcal{P}^{\rm exc} = c_0^2 \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} d\tau \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} d\tau' \; e^{-i\Delta E(\tau-\tau')} G^+_{T_0}[x^\mu(\tau), x^\mu(\tau')], \tag{1}$$

where c_0 is a small coupling constant between the detector and the scalar field, $\Delta E \equiv E - E_0$, and

$$G^+_{T_0}[x^\mu(\tau), x^\mu(\tau')] = -\sum_{n=-\infty}^{+\infty} \frac{(4\pi^2)^{-1}}{(t-t'-in/T_0-i\varepsilon)^2 - |\mathbf{x}-\mathbf{x}'|^2}, \tag{2}$$

is the thermal Wightman function, where $x^\mu(\tau)$ is the detector's world line, and τ is its proper time. (We have assumed $\langle E|m(0)|E_0\rangle \equiv 1$, since the selectivity only depends on the properties of the detector, and it is a constant which always can be factored out [18].) Substituting the world line of a detector moving with constant velocity v: $t = \tau/\sqrt{1-v^2}$, $z = vt$, $x = y = 0$, in (2), we obtain from (1) after some algebra [19] that the detector's excitation rate is

$$\frac{d\mathcal{P}^{\rm exc}}{d\tau} = c_0^2 \frac{T_0\sqrt{1-v^2}}{4\pi v} \ln\left[\frac{1-e^{-\Delta E\sqrt{1+v}/T_0\sqrt{1-v}}}{1-e^{-\Delta E\sqrt{1-v}/T_0\sqrt{1+v}}}\right]. \tag{3}$$

Here it is enough to consider the detector as being permanently switched on, rather than as being switched off asymptotically [20], since this is a stationary situation. In the limit $v \to 0$ we obtain the usual black body excitation rate [18]

$$\frac{d\mathcal{P}^{\rm exc}}{d\tau} = \frac{c_0^2 \Delta E}{2\pi(e^{\Delta E/T_0}-1)}, \tag{4}$$

while in the limit $v \to 1$, we obtain $d\mathcal{P}^{\rm exc}/d\tau \to 0$. This means that ultra-relativistic detectors do not interact appreciably with the background thermal bath (see Fig.1). It can be understood physically on energy conservation grounds. An inertial Unruh-DeWitt detector only responds to the presence of modes with very precise frequency $\omega = \Delta E$ as measured in its rest frame S. Hence, when v is large, half of the particles present in the bath are so much red-shifted while the other half are so much blue-shifted that it cannot be excited.

It is clear from (3) that the moving detector does not respond according to a black body spectrum. The particle number distribution $n(\omega)$ in the frame S can be written directly from (3) as

$$n(\omega)d^3\tilde{\mathbf{k}} = \frac{T_0\sqrt{1-v^2}}{4\pi v}\ln\left[\frac{1-e^{-\omega\sqrt{1+v}/T_0\sqrt{1-v}}}{1-e^{-\omega\sqrt{1-v}/T_0\sqrt{1+v}}}\right]d^3\tilde{\mathbf{k}}, \tag{5}$$

where $d^3\tilde{\mathbf{k}} \equiv d^3\mathbf{k}/4\pi^2\omega = d\omega\omega/\pi$. Notice that in the limit $v \to 0$, we obtain the usual black body particle number distribution

$$n_0(\omega)d^3\tilde{\mathbf{k}} = \frac{\omega^2 d\omega}{2\pi^2(e^{\omega/T_0}-1)}. \tag{6}$$

Let us analyze the infrared sector, $\omega << T_0$, of $n(\omega)$ for $v << 1$. This sector can be physically probed through a slow moving two–level detector with $\Delta E << T_0$. In this case, we obtain from (5)

$$n(\omega << T_0) \approx T_0(1-v^2/6)/2\pi. \tag{7}$$

Analogously, we obtain from (6) in the region $\omega << T_0$

$$n_0(\omega << T_0) \approx T_0/2\pi. \tag{8}$$

Now, comparing (7) and (8) we are able to define naturally an effective temperature of the thermal bath as measured in S by

$$T \approx T_0(1-v^2/6). \tag{9}$$

It is now instructive to compare this result against the one obtained by completely different means in Refs. [11-13], and recently corroborated thermodynamically in [14]. Using special relativity, Bracewell and Conklin, Peebles and Wilkinson, and Henry et al, showed that an observer in S looking at some *fixed* direction would still map out the background thermal bath into a blackbody spectrum. Thus, they defined in the moving frame an effective *directional* temperature

$$T(T_0, v, \theta) = \frac{T_0\sqrt{1-v^2}}{1-v\cos\theta}, \tag{10}$$

as a function of the angle θ as measured in S between the axis of motion and the direction of observation. Since our detector is a monopole, the best we can do is to compare our results with the average of (10) in the solid angle

$$\langle T\rangle = \frac{1}{4\pi}\int T(T_0, v, \theta)d\Omega. \tag{11}$$

Performing this integral we obtain

$$\langle T\rangle = T_0(1 - v^2/6), \tag{12}$$

which coincides with (9) .

The results above suggest that a thermometer moving with respect to a background thermal bath would *always* ascribe a smaller temperature in comparison with another thermometer lying at rest in the bath. Nevertheless, we are not allowed to make such a general claim. In order to define uniquely an effective temperature in the moving frame S, we should be able first to express (5) in the black body form [see Eq. (6)]

$$n(\omega)d^3\tilde{\mathbf{k}} = \frac{\omega^2 d\omega}{2\pi^2(e^{\omega/T} - 1)}, \tag{13}$$

for some analytic function $T = T(T_0, v)$ without any angular dependence. Since this is impossible, it is necessary to define some prescription to generalize the concept of temperature as above. Notwithstanding, we emphasize that different prescriptions may result in opposite conclusions.

In order to illustrate how a thermometer sensitive to the whole spectrum could reach a distinct conclusion in comparison with (9), let us consider a device sensitive to the whole particle spectrum rather than just to the low-frequency part. The particle density associated with some particle distribution $n(\omega)$ can be calculated by

$$\bar{n} = \int n(\omega)d^3\tilde{\mathbf{k}}. \tag{14}$$

In order to obtain the particle density in S_0, we use (6) in (14) obtaining [21]

$$\bar{n}_0 = \frac{T_0^3\zeta(3)}{\pi^2}, \tag{15}$$

where $\zeta(x)$ is the zeta function. Analogously, in order to calculate the particle density in S, we use (5) in (14), obtaining

$$\bar{n} = \frac{\gamma T_0^3\zeta(3)}{\pi^2}, \tag{16}$$

where $\gamma \equiv (1-v^2)^{-1/2}$. Notice that $\bar{n}_0$ and $\bar{n}$ only differ by a γ factor which expresses the Lorentz contraction of the volume. By comparing (15) and (16), it is natural according to this procedure to define another effective temperature for the bath as measured in S given by

$$T = T_0(1 - v^2)^{-1/6}. \tag{17}$$

In the limit $v << 1$, (17) can be cast in the simpler form

$$T \approx T_0(1 + v^2/6). \tag{18}$$

Hence, a slow moving thermometer sensitive only to the low-energy part of the spectrum would measure according to (9) an effective temperature $T < T_0$, while a slow moving device sensitive to the whole energy spectrum could measure according to (18) an effective temperature $T > T_0$. This is so because in the last case the high-frequency part of the spectrum plays a significant role in increasing the temperature (see Fig.1). There is no contradiction between these results, since they do not disagree concerning any real events. On the contrary, both are a direct consequence of (3).

In summary, we have investigated the classical controversy about whether moving thermometers in a background thermal bath with temperature T_0 behave as being hotter or colder. For this purpose we have used an Unruh-DeWitt detector as a thermometer, since it had been introduced with success in the context of semi-classical gravity in connection with black hole evaporation. We have obtained that slow moving thermometers sensitive only to the infrared part of the spectrum would measure a temperature $T \approx T_0(1 - v^2/6)$. This result is compatible with the one obtained in [11–13] by completely different means. However, other devices sensitive to the whole spectrum may give different results (18). We have argued that this result rather than expressing a contradiction, just reflects the fact that the frequency spectrum in the moving frame is not the usual black body one. It is important to recall that inequivalent definitions of temperature can be allowed provided they do not disagree over any real events. However, this warns us that the question about how temperature transforms under Lorentz transformations does not make sense unless one defines carefully what the considered thermometer is.

Acknowledgements

We are indebted to stimulating discussions with R. Aldrovandi, and S. Salinas. We are also grateful to R. Aldrovandi, J.S. Guillén, D. Hadjimichef, U. Heller, A. Natale, and V. Pleitez for their comments in the final manuscript. (SC) was full supported by Coordenadoria de Aperfeiçoamento de Pessoal de Nível Superior, while (GM) was partially supported by Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Científico e Tecnologico.

References

[1] Nature **214**, (1067) 1069; **221**, (1969) 1100; **224**, (1969) 219.

[2] A. Einstein, Jahrb. der Radioaktivität und Elektronik **4**, (1907) 411.

[3] M. Planck, Ann. der Physik **26**, (1908) 1.

[4] R.C. Tolman, *Relativity, Thermodynamics and Cosmology*, (Claredon Press, Oxford, 1934).

[5] W. Pauli, *Theory of Relativity*, (Pergamon Press, London, 1958).

[6] M. Von Laue, *Die Relativitätstheorie* (Vieweg, Braunschweig, 1961).

[7] H. Ott, Z. Phys. **175**, (1963) 70.

[8] H. Arzeliès, Nuovo Cimento **35**, (1965) 792.

[9] J.H. Fremlin, Nature **213**, (1967) 277.

[10] P.T. Landsberg, Nature **212**, (1966) 571; Phys. Rev. Lett **45**, (1980) 149.

[11] R.N. Bracewell and E.K. Conklin, Nature **219**, (1968) 1343.

[12] P.J.E. Peebles, and D.T. Wilkinson, Phys. Rev. D **174**, (1968) 2168.

[13] G.R. Henry, R.B. Feduniak, J.E. Silver, and M.A. Peterson, Phys. Rev. **176**, (1968) 1451.

[14] R. Aldrovandi, and J. Gariel, Phys. Lett. **A170**, (1992) 5.

[15] W.G. Unruh, Phys. Rev. D **14**, (1976) 870.

[16] P.C.W. Davies, J. Phys. A: Gen. Phys. **8**, (1975) 609.

[17] B. S. DeWitt, *General Relativity*, eds. S. W. Hawking and W. Israel (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1979).

[18] N.D. Birrell and P.C.W. Davies, *Quantum Field Theory in Curved Space*, (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1982).

[19] I.S. Gradshteyn and I.M. Ryzhik, *Table of Integrals, Series and Products* (Academic Press, New York, 1980).

[20] A. Higuchi, G.E.A. Matsas, C.B. Peres, Phys. Rev. D **48**, (1993) 3731.

[21] R.K. Pathria, *Statistical Mechanics* (Pergamon Press, 1977).

Figure 1: $d\mathcal{P}^{\rm exc}/d\tau$ is plotted as a function of the detector's velocity v, and its energy gap ΔE for $T_0 = 1$, and $c_0 = 10^{-1}$. For $v = 0$ we obtain the usual black body spectrum, while for $v \to 1$ the excitation rate vanishes. For detectors with $\Delta E << T_0$ the maximum excitation rate is obtained for $v = 0$, while for detectors with $\Delta E >> T_0$ the maximum excitation rate is obtained for some value $v > 0$. This is the reason why slow moving thermometers which only probe the infrared part of the spectrum measure a temperature $T < T_0$, while thermometers which probe the whole spectrum may measure a temperature $T > T_0$.

This figure "fig1-1.png" is available in "png" format from:

http://arXiv.org/ps/gr-qc/9505045v1